#### **REMARKS**

### I. Claim Status

By this response, Applicants have amended claim 1. Support for those amendments can be found through out the specification, for example:

Limitation	Support
a thickness of between 0.01 and 15 μm	page 6, lines 3-5
said system being in the form of a disc shaped device comprising a microchannel structure including said secondary process paths	page 13, lines 9-15
said disc shaped device being essentially circular comprising a centre, said microchannel structure being arranged around said centre	page 14, line 34 to page 15, line 9

Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

# II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

The Office rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,214,191 B1 to Wiktorowicz et al. ("Wiktorowicz"). Office Action at page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element as set forth in the claims must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendment to claim 1 renders this rejection moot. Specifically, Applicants submit that Wiktororwicz does not teach a system being in the form of a disc-shaped device comprising a microchannel structure, wherein the microchannel structure is arranged around the center of the disc.

Furthermore, Wikorowicz is silent with respect to the thickness of the coating.

Specifically, Wiktorowicz does not teach a coating with a thickness of between 0.01  $\mu m$  and 15  $\mu m$  as recited in amended claim 1. In fact, Wiktorowicz only discloses a depth dimension, i.e. interfacial distance between the major opposing surfaces of plates, of about 50 to 200  $\mu m$ . Wiktorowicz, col. 10, lines 10-12. Accordingly, Wiktorowicz does not teach every element recited in independent claim 1 and hence Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection be withdrawn.

## III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

The Office rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,676,819 to Liu et al. ("Liu") and by U.S. Patent No. 6,974,526 B2 to Lee et al. ("Lee") for the reasons described on pages 3-5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

## A. Liu does not teach every element recited in claim 1

Liu is directed to separation systems involving capillary electrophoresis. See Liu col. 1, line 35-44. However, Lou does not teach a "disc shaped device being essentially circular comprising a centre, said microchannel structure being arranged around said centre" as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, nowhere does Lou teach a coating with a thickness of between 0.01 and 15  $\mu$ m as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Lou does not teach every element recited in independent claim 1 and hence Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/531,076 Attorney Docket No. 10732.0002

B. Lee does not teach every element recited in claim 1

Lee does not teach a "disc shaped device being essentially circular comprising a

centre, said microchannel structure being arranged around said centre" as recited in

claim 1. Furthermore, nowhere does Lee teach a coating with a thickness of between

0.01 and 15 µm as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Lee does not teach every element

recited in independent claim 1 and hence Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e)

rejection be withdrawn.

IV. <u>Conclusion</u>

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the

claimed invention is not anticipated by the prior art references cited by the Office.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this

application and the timely allowance of the pending claim.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,

GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 23, 2008

Anthony & Tridico

Reg. No. 45,958